(V) ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE CHECKLIST

This checklist is used to identify physical, biological, social and economic factors which might be impacted by the proposed project. In many cases, the background studies performed in connection with this project clearly indicate the project will not affect a particular item. A NO answer in the column documents this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, an asterisk is shown next to the answer. The discussion is in the section following the checklist.

PHYSICAL - Will the proposal either directly or indirectly:		YES	NO
1.	Appreciably change the topography or ground surface relief features		X
2.	Destroy, cover, or modify any unique geological or physical features		X
3.	Result in unstable earth surfaces or increase the exposure of people or		
	property to geological or seismic hazards.		X
4.	Result in or be affected by soil erosion or siltation (whether by water or wind)		X
5.	Result in the increased use of fuel or energy in large amounts		
	or in a wasteful manner?		X
6.	Result in an increase in the rate of use of any natural resource?		X
7.	Result in the substantial depletion of any nonrenewable resource?	-	X
8.	Violate any published Federal, State, or local standards pertaining to hazardous		
•	waste, solid waste or litter control?		X
9.	Modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any		
	bay, inlet or lake?		X
10.	Encroach upon a floodplain or result in or be affected by floodwaters or tidal waves?		X X
11.	Adversely affect the quantity or quality of surface water, ground water, or		
	public water supply		X
12.	Result in the use of water in large amounts or in a wasteful manner?		X
13.	Affect wetlands or riparian vegetation?		X
14.	Violate or be inconsistent with Federal, State, or local water quality standards?		X
15.	Result in changes in air movement, moisture, or temperature, or any		
	climatic conditions.		X
16.	Result in an increase in air pollutant emissions, adverse effects on or		
	deterioration of ambient air quality?		X
17.	Result in the creation of objectionable odors?		X
18.	Violate or be inconsistent with Federal, State, or local air standards		
	or control plans?		X
19.	Result in an increase in noise levels or vibration for adjoining areas?		X*
20.	Result in any Federal, State, or local noise criteria being equal or exceeded?		X*
21.	Produce new light, glare, or shadows?		X
BIO	LOGICAL . Will the proposal result in (either directly or indirectly):		
22.	Change in the diversity of species or number of any species of plants		
	(including trees, shrubs, grass, microflora, and aquatic plants)?		X
23.	Reduction of the numbers of or encroachment upon the critical habitat of any		
	unique, threatened or endangered species of plants)?		X
		-	

		YES	NO
24.	Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or result in a barrier	1120	110
	to the normal replenishment of existing species?		X
25.	Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop or commercial timber stand,		37
	or affect prime, unique, or other farmland of State or local importance?		<u>X</u>
26.	Removal or deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat?		X
27.	Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals		
	(birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms,		v
28.	insects or microfauna)? Reduction of the numbers of or encroachment upon the critical habitat of any		X
20.	unique, threatened or endangered species of animals?		X
29.	Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a		Λ
2).	barrier to the migration or movement of animals?		X
	ourse to the ingration of movement of animals.		
SOC	CIAL AND ECONOMIC. Will the proposal directly or indirectly:		
30.	Cause disruption of orderly planned development?		X
31.	Be inconsistent with any elements of adopted community plans, policies		
	or goals, or the California Urban Strategy?		X X
32.	Be inconsistent with a Coastal Zone Management Plan?		X
33.	Affect the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human		**
24	population of an area?		X
34. 35.	Affect life-styles, or neighborhood character or stability? Affect minority, elderly, handicapped, transit-dependent, or other	-	X*
33.	specific interest groups?		X *
36	Divide or disrupt an established community?		X* X
37.	Affect existing housing, require the acquisition of residential improvements		
	or the displacement of people or create a demand for additional housing?		X*
38.	Affect employment, industry or commerce, or require the displacement		
	of businesses or farms?		X*
39.	Affect property values or the local tax base?		X*
40.	Affect any community facilities (including medical, educational, scientific,		**
41	recreational, or religious institutions, ceremonial sites or sacred shrines)?		X
41.	Affect public utilities, or police, fire, emergency or other public services?		X
42.	Have substantial impact on existing transportation systems or alter present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?		X*
43.	Generate additional traffic?	-	$\frac{X}{X}$
44.	Affect or be affected by existing parking facilities or result in demand		
• • •	for new parking?		X
45.	Involve a substantial risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances		
	in the event of an accident or otherwise adversely affect overall public safety?		X
46.	Result in alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?		X
47.	Support large commercial or residential development?		T T.1.
48.	Affect a significant archaeological or historic site, structure, object or building?		X* X
49. 50	Affect wild or scenic rivers or natural landmarks?		X
50.	Affect any scenic resources or result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?		X
51.	Result in substantial impacts associated with construction activities (e.g., noise,		
01.	dust, temporary drainage, traffic detours and temporary access, etc.)?		X
	, 1		

1

52.	Result in the use of any publicly-owned land from a park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge?	YES_	NO X*	
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
53.	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X	
54.	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)		X	
55.	Does the project have environmental effects which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. It includes the effects of other projects which interact with this project and, together, are considerable.		X	
56.	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X	

(VI) Discussion of Environmental Evaluation

Result in any noise levels or vibration for adjoining areas or result in any noise criteria being equal or exceeded? (#19& #20)

Alternative B would result in noise increases to certain residents such that a soundwall would be feasible to reduce noise impacts. Under Alternative B noise levels would increase at eleven locations and approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) at eight locations. On the north side of proposed alternate B, constructing a 10 ft (3 m) high, 405 ft (124 m) long soundwall would benefit six residences by mitigating noise levels to below the NAC. On the south side a soundwall would not be reasonable because of cost. The reasonableness criteria allows an expenditure of \$38,000 per benefited residence. Since only two residences on the south side would benefit, sound wall construction could not exceed \$76,000. The actual cost of the soundwall however, would be approximately \$112,000 which would significantly exceed the allowable cost.

For Alternatives A1 and C the noise levels would not approach or exceed the NAC and no mitigation is required.